



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,391	12/07/2001	Nabil Enrique Salman	8384R	6122

27752 7590 11/21/2005

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION  
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161  
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE  
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANH K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3721

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

10-010-591

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------


11172005

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

It has been brought to the examiner's attention that the Examiner's Answer dated March 29, 2005 did not comply with the new rule that requires the initials of all the appeal conferees. Attached is a corrected Examiner's Answer with the initials of the conferees.

  
Stephen F. Gerrity  
Primary Examiner



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/010,391  
Filing Date: December 07, 2001  
Appellant(s): SALMAN ET AL.

**MAILED**

**NOV 21 2005**

**Group 3700**

---

Jay A. Krebs  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed February 25, 2005.

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) *Claims Appealed***

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) *Prior Art of Record***

3,111,796	W. E. Meissner	10-1963
4,869,049	Richards et al.	09-1989
5,662,758	Hamilton et al.	09-1997

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11, 13-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards et al. (4,869,049) in view of Hamilton et al (5,662,758) and W. E. Meissner (3,111,796).

Richards discloses an apparatus comprising: a body formed by an inner core having an inlet opening and an outlet opening and a passageway there between (figures 1, 4 & 5); a casing 1 comprising a surrounding casing wall, a storage space to retain a length of the flexible tubular sheet 2 within the storage space in a layered stack; the tubular sheet is gathered and closed at each end to form a closed packaged article 35 (figure 1); a means 61 comprises a slot for separating the closed packaged article; and the cutting blade 64 (figure 6).

Richards further discloses the article to be packaged is a waste-filled disposable absorbent article (column 2, lines 42-44).

Richards discloses the claimed invention, but does not expressly disclose that the tubular sheet comprises the adhesive material.

W. E. Meissner discloses, in an invention for closing and sealing a container, that: "for closing and sealing a collapsible container by rupturing a bubble of tacky film-forming material at least within the opening end of the container as that portion of the container is urged into collapsed position" (column 1, lines 31-35). Figure 5 further depicting the closing and sealing of a flexible bag by twisting the bag at the area 53. During this twisting operation, the bubble ruptured and coated the inner wall of the bag with adhesive (column 5, lines 48-55).

Hamilton discloses a flexible film having pressure sensitive adhesive protected from inadvertent adherence (abstract); the flexible film having a recessed pressure sensitive adhesive and collapsible protrusions (three-dimensional film) which serve as stand-off to prevent premature sticking to wide variety of rigid and resilient target surfaces, wherein the collapsible protrusions are small and closely spaced for releasable sealing of the composite material to such surfaces or even to itself (column 3, lines 20-26).

W. E. Meissner's teaching provides a motivation for the practitioner in the art to find a flexible material to use as a bag in which the inner surface is coated with adhesive, and when pressure is applied such as twisting, the adhesive material ensures the sealing of the closure of the bag.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to modify Richards' tubular sheet by applying the flexible film with adhesive as taught by Hamilton providing an effective closing and

sealing of the waste-filled article in which the flexible material having pressure sensitive adhesive that is protected from inadvertent adherence to other surfaces.

Regarding to claim 8, the modified Richards discloses the claimed invention, but does not expressly disclose that the shape of the outlet opening and a portion of the passageway are oval.

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the outlet opening and a portion of the passageway in an oval shape.

Since Applicant's disclosure submitted that the shape of either or both the inlet and outlet opening can be circular, or oval (page 5, lines 20-22), therefore, the apparatus of the present invention would perform equally well with the outlet opening of a circular shape. Thus, the oval shape outlet opening would have been an obvious variation of the present invention.

Regarding to claim 15, Richards discloses the claimed invention, but does not expressly disclose the device has a compact dimension of a height along a vertical axis less than 20 centimeters and a width along a horizontal axis of less than 17 centimeters. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device having a compact dimension (as cited in claim 15) providing consumers a portable, light weight device, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

**(11) Response to Argument**

The appellant's argument regarding the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11 and 13-14 is that there is no motivation to combine the cited references because the cited references teach away from the suggested combination. The examiner disagrees.

Richards' reference teaches a portable apparatus that using the tubing flexible bags for storing and disposal of hygienic material such as soiled baby's nappies, thus bags that provide effective sealing to eliminate the smell is certainly most desirable (column 1, lines 14-24).

Meissner teaches that an adhesive lining material of a flexible bag (at least partially within the open end of the bags) when closes by twisting (pressed together) provides a leakproof closure (column 1, lines 15-17 and lines 31-35, column 4, lines 50-54 and column 5, lines 48-55).

Hamilton teaches a flexible film having pressure sensitive adhesive protected from inadvertent adherence which does not stick until pressed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made, to seek out a flexible material such as the one taught by Hamilton to use in the Richard's apparatus. Meissner was relied upon to show that why one would seek to replace Richard's flexible tubing material by using the pressure sensitive flexible bag as taught by Hamilton, because it is desirable to find a flexible material that will stick together when pressed and also preventing the odor to leak out.



The appellant also argues that there is no motivation to combine the references because the primary reference (Richards) teach away from the use of the film of Hamilton, and combine the reference would render the reference unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. The examiner disagrees.

Richards teaches that: the disposal package is closed by manually twisting of the flexible bag (see figures 1-5), a single package can be formed to fill the portable apparatus, different sizes of bag can be made by using the device, and effective sealing is desired because it eliminates the unwanted smell. As discussed in above paragraph, Meissner teaches that using a flexible material with adhesive lining and when twists to seal provides a bag that is leakproof, therefore seeking out the material as taught by Hamilton is reasonable and logical and is inline with teaching from Richards and Meissner.

The appellant's argument regarding the rejection of claims 15, 16 and 18 is that the rejection is improper, because the combination of cited references fail to teach or suggest a "slot adapted for compressively gathering said tubular sheet as the tubular sheet is inserted and moved through the slot" (claim 15). The examiner disagrees.


Figure 6 of Richards clearly discloses that the slot defines between member part 62 and 63 is adaptable for compressively gathering of the tubular sheet as the tubular sheet is inserted and moved through the slot.

The appellant further argues that there is no teaching of a packaging device having a height of less than 20 cm and a width less than 17 cm. The examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to make or modify Richards' device so that it is compact in according to the cited dimensions to provide a portable, light weight device, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Rinaldi I. Rada  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700

Thanh K. Truong *tk*  
November 16, 2005

Conferees  
Rinaldi Rada *R*

John Sipos *JS*

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION  
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161  
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE  
CINCINNATI, OH 45224